## SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF VENTURA VENTURA DIVISION

## **TENTATIVE RULINGS**

JUDICIAL OFFICER: Kevin DeNoce

CASE NUM: 56-2017-00493298-CU-BC-VTA CASE TITLE: ARELLANO VS. OKYERE

CASE CATEGORY: Civil - Unlimited CASE TYPE: Breach of Contract/Warranty

EVENT TYPE: Motion to Quash Subpoena (CLM)

CAUSAL DOCUMENT/DATE FILED: Motion - Other, 07/03/2018

This case has been assigned to Judge DeNoce for all purposes. The morning calendar before Judge Kevin G. DeNoce will begin at 9 a.m. in courtroom 43. Cases including *ex parte* matters will not be called prior to 9 a.m. Please check in with the courtroom clerk by no later than 8:45 a.m. If appearing by Court Call, please call in between 8:35 and 8:45 a.m.

If you wish to submit on the court's tentative decision, please send an email to the court at: <a href="mailto:Courtroom43@ventura.courts.ca.gov">Courtroom43@ventura.courts.ca.gov</a> stating that you submit on the tentative, and copy all counsel/parties on your email. Do not call in lieu of sending an email. If you submit on the tentative without appearing and the opposing party appears, the hearing will be conducted in your absence.

Absent waiver of notice and in the event an order is not signed at the hearing, the prevailing party shall prepare a proposed order and comply with CRC 3.1312 subdivisions (a), (b), (d) and (e). The signed order shall be served on all parties and a proof of service filed with the court. A "notice of ruling" in lieu of this procedure is not authorized.

For general information regarding Judge DeNoce and his courtroom rules and procedures, please visit: <a href="http://www.denoce.com">http://www.denoce.com</a>

Motion to Quash Subpoena or for a Protective Order Pursuant to CCP Section 1987.1 by Defendant Francis Okyere ("Okyere") (Pro Per) "dba Western Alliance Insurance Services, Inc."

## The court's tentative ruling is as follows:

The court intends to deny the motion to quash the subpoenas or for a protective order. Western cannot bring the motion because it is suspended by the Franchise Tax Board. In any event, Okyere has failed to justify the privacy objection. Therefore, the discovery will be allowed. Plaintiff's request for sanctions is DENIED. Plaintiff has not shown that the motion was made in bad faith. (See CCP, § 1987.2.) Okyere's request to dismiss the assignment order is DENIED. Since Defendants have not posted an undertaking, there is no stay of enforcement of the judgment. (See CCP, §§ 917.1 & 917.2.)